



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 8, 2005

Ms. Sylvia N. Salazar
Assistant General Counsel
Employees Retirement System of Texas
P. O. Box 13207
Austin, Texas 78711-3207

OR2005-05006

Dear Ms. Salazar:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 224740.

The Employees Retirement System of Texas (the "system") received a request for proposals "for prescription benefit management services dated September 2004." You state that you are releasing some of the requested information. You claim, however, that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.110 of the Government Code. In addition, you state that release of the requested information may implicate the proprietary interests of the following companies: Catalyst Rx, a HealthExtras Company ("Catalyst"); Prime Therapeutics L.L.C. ("Prime"); Walgreens Health Initiatives ("Walgreens"); and Medco Health Solutions, Inc. ("Medco"). Accordingly, you notified these companies of the request and of each company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released. *See Gov't Code* § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under the Act in certain circumstances). We received comments from Prime, Walgreens, and Medco. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why

information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this decision, Catalyst has not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, this company has provided us with no basis to conclude that it has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information, and none of the information may be withheld on that basis. *See, e.g.*, Gov't Code § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990).

The system and Medco both claim that certain information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *See* Gov't Code § 552.101; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 611 at 1 (1992) (relating to common-law privacy), 600 at 4 (1992) (relating to constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (relating to statutory confidentiality). While the system claims section 552.101 in conjunction with section 552.110, we note that exceptions under the Act do not constitute statutory law for purposes of section 552.101. Neither Medco nor the system provides any other arguments that demonstrate that any of the submitted information is confidential by law. Furthermore, we are not aware of any provision of law that makes the submitted information confidential under section 552.101. Therefore, the system may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101.

Medco and Walgreens assert that each company's information is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." The purpose of section 552.104 is to protect a governmental body's interests in competitive bidding situations. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991). Section 552.104 is not designed to protect the interests of private parties that submit information to a governmental body. *See id.* at 8-9. The system does not argue that the release of any of the submitted information would harm the system's interests in a particular competitive situation. Therefore, no portion of the submitted information pertaining to Medco or Walgreens is excepted from disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

The system, Medco, Prime, and Walgreens claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code. This section protects the property interests of private persons by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision and (2) commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b).

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). Section 757 provides that a trade secret is

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. . . . [It may] relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement's definition of trade secret as well as the Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.¹ *Id.* This office has held that if a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the trade secret branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we must accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) applies unless it has been shown that the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that

¹The six factors that the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret are:

(1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company]; (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others involved in [the company's] business; (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information; (4) the value of the information to [the company] and [its] competitors; (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information; (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). Section 552.110(b) requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

Based on our review of the arguments of Medco, Prime, and Walgreens and the submitted information, we conclude that the system must withhold Medco’s customer information under section 552.110(a). However, Medco, Prime, and Walgreens have failed to show that any of the remaining information that each seeks to withhold is protected as a trade secret under section 552.110(a). Further, we find that these companies have adequately demonstrated that some of the information each company seeks to withhold constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm for purposes of section 552.110(b). Accordingly, the system must withhold the information that we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(b). We find, however, that Medco, Prime, and Walgreens have not sufficiently shown that the release of any of the remaining information would be likely to cause any of these companies substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 509 at 5 (1988) (because costs, bid specifications, and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts was entirely too speculative), 319 at 3 (1982) (finding that statutory predecessor to section 552.110 generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing, and that pricing proposals are entitled to protection only during bid submission process), 184 (1978). We note that the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110. *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors). *See generally* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview, 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Moreover, we believe the public has a strong interest in the release of prices in government contract awards. *See* Open Records Decision No. 494 (1988) (requiring balancing of public interest in disclosure with competitive injury to company). In addition, we find that the system has not provided specific factual evidence to support the allegation that release of any of the submitted information would cause any of these companies substantial competitive injury. We therefore conclude that none of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110.

We note that the remaining submitted records contain insurance policy numbers that are subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code. This section provides that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” Gov’t Code § 552.136. Accordingly, the system must withhold these insurance policy numbers pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Finally, we note that some of the information at issue may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are protected by copyright. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of materials protected by copyright, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

To summarize, the system must withhold the marked information under section 552.110 of the Government Code. We have marked the insurance policy numbers that must be withheld under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor; however, in releasing information that is protected by copyright, the system must comply with applicable copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/krl

Ref: ID# 224740

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Amy Bonfiglio
Caremark
2211 Sanders Road, NBT-5
Northbrook, Illinois 60062
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Kenneth T. Williams
Catalyst Rx
One Alliance Center
3500 Lenox Road, Suite 1500
Atlanta, Georgia 30326
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Richard F. Busch, II
Lindquist & Vennum P.L.L.P.
4200 IDS Center
80 South Eighth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402-2274
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Larry Anderson
Senior Attorney
Walgreens Health Initiatives
1417 Lake Cook Road - MS L468
Deerfield, Illinois 60015
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Cheryl Baker
Prime Therapeutics L.L.C.
1020 Discovery #100
Eagan, Minnesota 55121
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David Arciszewski
Medco Health Solutions Inc.
100 Parsons Pond Drive
Franklin Lakes, New Jersey 07417
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Richard L. Josephson
Baker Botts L.L.P.
One Shell Plaza
910 Louisiana
Houston, Texas 77002-4995
(w/o enclosures)